



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

80

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/816,832	03/22/2001	Richard L. Mueller	5756-0012.30	6135
20583	7590	05/02/2005	EXAMINER	
JONES DAY 222 EAST 41ST ST NEW YORK, NY 10017			SHAY, DAVID M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3739	

DATE MAILED: 05/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/816,832

Applicant(s)

MUELLER ET AL.

Examiner

david shay

Art Unit

3739

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on December 22, 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 14 and 15 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 3739

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spears et al in combination with Narciso, Jr. Spears et al teaches a device as claimed except the use of a perfusion channel and the particular lumen diameter. Narciso, Jr. teaches a device as claimed except the specific recitation that the fibers are removable and the lumen diameter. It would have been obvious to the artisan of ordinary skill to employ perfusion in the device of Spears et al, since this prevents tissue damage down stream of the treatment or alternatively to employ the manifestly insertable fiber of Spears et al in the device of Narciso, Jr., since Narciso, Jr. discusses no attachment of the fibers, and the catheter absent the fibers would be more flexible and thus more easily positioned, and in either case to employ a lumen diameter in the claimed range, since this is an appropriate size to accommodate the guide wire and solves no particular problem in the art, thus producing a device such as claimed.

Claims 1 and 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spears et al in combination with Narciso, Jr. The teachings of Narciso, Jr. and Spears et al and the motivation for combination and modification thereof are essentially those already set forth regarding claims 6-9. Thus it would have been obvious to the artisan of ordinary skill to combine these old and well known teachings to produce a method such as claimed.

Art Unit: 3739

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spears et al in combination with Narciso, Jr. as applied to claims 1 and 3-5 above, and further in view of Chen et al. Chen et al teach the use of e.g. hematoporphyrin derivative as a photodynamic therapy compound. It would have been obvious to the artisan of ordinary skill to employ hematoporphyrin derivative in the combined method of Narciso, Jr. and Spears et al, since the method of Narciso, Jr. is dependant on no particular compound and since this compound is widely known for its efficacy in PDT, thus producing a method such as claimed.

Claims 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abela in combination with Altman et al. Abela teaches a device such as claimed except for the syringes in the handle. Altman et al teach the employment of syringes in the handle of an infusion catheter. It would have been obvious to the artisan of ordinary skill to employ syringes in the handle of the catheter of Abela, since this would act as a unit and would not clutter the operating theater with additional lines or to employ the diffuser of Abela in the device of Altman et al, since this would enable, e.g. photodynamic treatment of the heart as is notorious in the art, official notice of which is hereby taken, thus producing a device such as claimed.

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abela in combination with Altman as applied to claims 10-12 and further in combination with Tennican et al. Tennican et al teaches providing an indicator to show which syringe is outputting to the catheter. It would have been obvious to the artisan of ordinary skill to employ an indicator to

Art Unit: 3739

show which syringe is currently active, since this will avoid confusion on the part of the physician, thus producing a device such as claimed.

Claims 14 and 15 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant's arguments filed December 22, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The arguments are not convincing for the reasons set forth above.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to david shay at telephone number 571-272-4773.



Shay/am

March 22, 2005

DAVID M. SHAY
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 330